

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

PERFORMANCE COUNTS!

**PERFORMANCE REPORTING INSTRUCTIONS
FY 2004/05**



JULY 2003



County of Los Angeles

CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

713 KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION • LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012
(213) 974-1101
<http://cao.co.la.ca.us>

DAVID E. JANSSEN
Chief Administrative Officer

July 23, 2003

Board of Supervisors
GLORIA MOLINA
First District

YVONNE BRATHWAITE BURKE
Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY
Third District

DON KNABE
Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH
Fifth District

PERFORMANCE COUNTS! ORIENTATION

Welcome to the Countywide Performance Counts! Orientation. I appreciate the priority you have given to this effort by your attendance today. We are embarking on a major initiative for measuring the results of the services we provide that will require your expertise and commitment as well as the commitment of your fellow departmental employees. The implementation plan we have developed is ambitious, but there will be consultant and mentor help available to every department to guide the way. We trust you will accept the challenge and serve as a resource and champion for this effort in your department.

We are one organization and despite the wide variety of services we provide, we have a common focus as stated in our Mission – To enrich lives through effective and caring service. The Performance Counts! performance reporting framework reflects the dual focus of our Mission by measuring not only the results of the services we provide but also how well the service is provided. This information is critical to the Board of Supervisors, and all County managers, in making strategic decisions and choices; further, the public demands such information to ensure that public resources are used most effectively.

This is not the County's first experience with performance measurement. The County began to increasingly focus on results with the adoption of the Strategic Plan, and many departments are already engaged in an important effort that directly aligns with Performance Counts! — the Children and Families Budget. In addition, a number of departments have engaged in their own strategic planning which includes using a performance measurement methodology.

Countywide implementation of Performance Counts! is the next step, reinforcing work that has already begun and formalizing on a countywide level a common performance reporting framework that is linked with our budget process.

Like any improvement effort, this will not be a one-time exercise — it is an ongoing effort. We will make important progress this year and then build on that progress over time. By Implementing Performance Counts!, we will make a fundamental change in how the County manages and evaluates the services it provides. The value is not necessarily in how much change we make this year, but how sustainable that change is for the long-term.

Thank you for the fine work you do on a daily basis and for your commitment to this important effort,

Sincerely,

DAVID E. JANSSEN
Chief Administrative Officer

DEJ:LS
MKZ:Nf:os

PERFORMANCE COUNTS!

WHAT IS *PERFORMANCE COUNTS!*?

Performance Counts! is a common performance reporting framework for the County of Los Angeles. *Performance Counts!* is the next step in the implementation of the County's Strategic Plan and is integrally linked with accomplishing the County's mission to "Enrich Lives Through Effective and Caring Service." *Performance Counts!* has been developed and piloted under the leadership of the Guiding Coalition (GC), a leadership team of County department heads and Board of Supervisors Chief Deputies/Chiefs of Staff who have guided the effort to update and implement the County Strategic Plan.

WHY IS *PERFORMANCE COUNTS!* CRITICAL?

The County faces a significant challenge in explaining to the public the results achieved, given the tremendous diversity of services provided by the County. A common set of terms is needed to allow the public, Board of Supervisors and stakeholders to understand results achieved, regardless of the specific service provided by any given department.

***PERFORMANCE COUNTS!* IS DESIGNED TO:**

- ☐ Increase accountability to the public for the County's accomplishments by providing performance information in a common, understandable, accessible format;
- ☐ Enable strategic business decisions, planning and investments through regular information on program results; and
- ☐ Reinforce department planning and performance measurement efforts by promoting a County culture which focuses on results.

HOW DOES THIS EFFORT LINK TO COUNTY AND DEPARTMENT STRATEGIC PLANNING EFFORTS?

The County's mission, "To Enrich Lives through Effective and Caring Service," emphasizes *what* the County achieves and *how* the County achieves those results. The County Strategic Plan Goals mirror this emphasis, including four programmatic goals focusing on *what* the County should achieve and four organizational goals focusing on *how* to achieve those results. *Performance Counts!* provides a common reporting format for the County similarly emphasizing what is achieved and how it is achieved.

The County Strategic Plan's overriding purpose is to move the County toward better results and improved services for all County residents. *Performance Counts!* is one part of that effort. Other components of the overall effort include the following:

- ☐ County Progress Report – an annual report to be initially published in December 2003 reflecting the County's contribution to the quality of life in Los Angeles County by publishing key community indicators and County performance measures.
- ☐ Management Appraisal and Performance Plan (MAAP) – a plan which monitors County manager's achievement of key Strategic Plan goals, strategies and related performance measures.
- ☐ Children and Families Budget – a program performance budget developed as part of the County Strategic Plan Goal 5: Children and Families' Well-Being. It is designed to measure the contribution the County and its partners are making towards improving the lives of children and families in five Board-approved outcome areas: good health; safety and survival; economic well-being; social and emotional well-being; and education/workforce readiness.

The County Progress Report will provide an annual assessment of various conditions for all Los Angeles County residents and the County's role in improving these community conditions. This project parallels the *Performance Counts!* effort, but provides a more comprehensive, integrated evaluation of various conditions that are critical to all County residents in terms of economic, environmental, social, and health indicators and how the County as an organization contributes to improved conditions for all County residents. *Performance Counts!*, on the other hand, focuses on the results of individual department programs and services and the results achieved for the specific client population served.

HOW WILL THIS INFORMATION BE USED IN THE BUDGET PROCESS?

County departments have been required to include performance data on each of the budget programs for several years. *Performance Counts!* will improve the quality of the performance data, provide a common reporting system and emphasize the organizational and programmatic goals of the County Strategic Plan. County managers and policymakers should have a better understanding of program results/accomplishments based on information provided through *Performance Counts!* and therefore be able to make more informed decisions during the budget process.

Secondly, *Performance Counts!* provides greater flexibility for departments to present measures which are applicable to, and representative of, the services they provide. The *Performance Counts!* framework no longer mandates the specific types of measures that departments must include in their budget submission and encourages managers to select those measures which link to their internal performance improvement efforts. Finally, by submitting performance data in advance of the budget process, Chief Administrative Office (CAO) analysts should have more time to work with departments in reviewing and evaluating performance results.

IF A DEPARTMENT HAS BEEN INVESTING IN PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT, DOES THIS REPORTING STRUCTURE REPLACE WHAT A DEPARTMENT IS DOING?

No, *Performance Counts!* is a common reporting format only and not a performance measurement methodology. *Performance Counts!* provides a simple reporting format with flexibility to reflect the culture and management approach of each County department.

The County Strategic Plan promotes accountability, results and measurements and requires all departments to move toward establishing a comprehensive system to measure their results. These efforts are bolstered through the *Performance Counts!* common reporting framework, but departments are free to continue using current underlying performance measurement methodologies. Departments that do not currently use a performance measurement system may find it necessary to adopt a methodology, such as Balanced Scorecard or Results-Based Decision Making, to generate the required performance data and to translate it into an action plan that can be implemented for strategic and operational improvements.

WHAT IS THE ROLE OF THE GUIDING COALITION (GC) IN THIS PROCESS?

It is the responsibility the GC to develop common guidelines to reinforce and implement the goals and objectives in the Strategic Plan. In this capacity, the GC monitored the development of *Performance Counts!* through the pilot process and endorsed the final pilot results for countywide implementation. County executive management accepted the GC's recommendation for implementation and roll-out of *Performance Counts!* at an Executive Strategic Planning Conference held in June 2003. It is the management responsibility of each department to develop the best approach or methodology to meet these guidelines and implement the tools necessary to manage its programs and operations through performance measurement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Frequently Asked Questions

I	Introduction.....	1
II	<i>Performance Counts!</i> Approach and Definitions	5
III	FY 2004/05 Budget Roll-Out.....	17

Appendices

- A. *Performance Counts!* Roll-Out Groups**
- B. *Performance Counts!* Worksheets**
- C. Pilot Department Examples**

I. INTRODUCTION

Performance Counts! represents the County of Los Angeles' focus on building an overall performance measurement framework for the County that will explain:

- ❑ What was achieved for specific clients and the general public as result of the County's programs and services;
- ❑ How well the services were provided; and
- ❑ Benefits and improvements achieved for Los Angeles County residents.

Performance Counts! builds from the County's success in updating the County Strategic Plan in December 2002. The plan includes strategies and objectives to develop a common reporting framework that will document program results through the annual budget process. While performance data has been included in the Proposed Budget for several years, *Performance Counts!* updates the reporting structure to:

- ❑ Increase accountability to the public for the County's accomplishments in a common, unified, accessible format;
- ❑ Enable strategic business decisions, planning and investments; and
- ❑ Reinforce department planning and performance measurement efforts by promoting a County culture which focuses on results.

LINKAGE TO COUNTY'S STRATEGIC PLAN

The County's Mission statement, "To enrich lives through effective and caring service," is the driving philosophy of the County's focus on performance reporting. The County's Mission statement places a dual emphasis on *what* the County achieves and *how* the County achieves those results. The County Strategic Plan goals mirror this emphasis, including four programmatic goals focusing on *what* the County should achieve and four organizational goals focusing on *how to achieve* them. *Performance Counts!* is designed to provide a common reporting format for this parallel emphasis on both the "what" and "how".

The County Strategic Plan's overriding purpose is to move the County toward better results and improved services for all County residents. *Performance Counts!* is one part of that effort. Other components of the overall effort include:

- ❑ County Progress Report – an annual report to be initially published in December 2003 reflecting major County performance measures in key service areas;
- ❑ Management Appraisal and Performance Plan (MAPP) – a plan which monitors achievement of key Strategic Plan goals, strategies and related performance measures by the County's managers; and
- ❑ Children and Families Budget – the work on developing a program performance budget linked to implementation of Goal 5: Children and Families' Well-Being can be built upon and leveraged in *Performance Counts!* Similar to goal five, *Performance Counts!* evaluates what was achieved and how well service was provided.

PILOT EFFORT

Performance Counts! was developed and piloted under the leadership of the Guiding Coalition (GC). The GC is comprised of County department heads and Board of Supervisors Chief Deputies/Chiefs of Staff who have guided the effort to update and implement the County Strategic Plan. The GC began the *Performance Counts!* effort through an initial pilot project from January through June 2003.

Four departments, Human Resources, Internal Services, Public Works and Community and Senior Services, served as pilot departments to test and validate the *Performance Counts!* approach. The objectives of the pilot effort were to:

- ❑ Develop a County of Los Angeles performance measurement framework within which different departmental performance measurement methodologies may co-exist and which ensures consistency with the County Strategic Plan and other related measurement efforts (e.g., the County Progress Report, the Proposed Budget, the Children and Families' Budget, and MAPP)
- ❑ Identify and address implementation challenges and assess impact of proposed change
- ❑ Develop recommendations for countywide deployment and implementation.

The input and experience of the pilot departments is reflected in these instructions as well as the roll-out plan for expanding the process countywide. Pilot departments will have a continuing role in serving as mentors for other County departments through this next phase of implementation.

Performance Counts! will replace the current reporting structure annually displayed in the Proposed Budget. And, while *Performance Counts!* is not a performance measurement system, it will support departmental efforts with the implementation of performance-based management that supports their own improvement efforts and reports progress to their management and constituencies.

II. **PERFORMANCE COUNTS! APPROACH AND DEFINITIONS**

APPROACH

The *Performance Counts!* common reporting format is based on answering two fundamental program evaluation questions:

- ❑ What results did we achieve?
- ❑ How well did we achieve those results?

The experience of the pilot departments demonstrated that regardless of which performance measurement methodology a department employs (e.g., Balanced Scorecard or Results-Based Decision Making), the performance data can be easily translated into the *Performance Counts!* reporting format.

The *Performance Counts!* reporting was developed based on the following guidelines:

- ❑ **Linkage with The County Mission and Strategic Plan** – The County’s Mission Statement and Strategic Plan place equal emphasis on both the process and results achieved. The *Performance Counts!* framework is intended to be consistent with and reflective of this dual emphasis by requiring measurement of both the results of efforts (change that has occurred from services provided/investment made) and the quality of the process by which the change occurred.
- ❑ **Simplicity** – Simple terms and language should be used to convey what is important and wherever possible, eliminate duplicative or conflicting terms.
- ❑ **Leverage** – *Performance Counts!* creates a common framework for performance measurement reporting that builds upon work that has been done by various departments without negating any individual efforts.
- ❑ **Flexibility** – The reporting format provides a common format for countywide reporting, while providing flexibility for departments and program managers to tailor the selection of measures to meet their operational and performance improvement objectives.

As explained in the next section, the cornerstone of the *Performance Counts!* reporting structure are program results,. Program results define the specific change in the clients served for the services provided. The term “program result” is used in *Performance Counts!* because it addresses the specific services provided to a specific client group. A similar concept is implied with the term “outcome.” The difference between an outcome and a program result is the scale of the service provided. Outcomes relate to County populations; whereas, program results relate to the specific clients served by a particular department program.

Outcomes are linked to the County Strategic Plan; whereas, program results relate to specific department services. In sum, it is through the combined results of many programs that improvements can be made on outcomes. Both program results and outcomes are measured through indicators.

TERMINOLOGY & DEFINITIONS

The *Performance Counts!* reporting framework is the common reporting structure for all programs to be presented in the annual proposed budget. Departments can rely on the programs presented in their FY 2003/04 Proposed Budget as the starting set of programs for *Performance Counts!* reporting.

The three key elements of the *Performance Counts!* framework are: **program result**, **program indicator**, and **operational measure**. Each are defined and explained below.

- **Program Result** – A statement of the intended consequence from the specific services or interventions provided for a specific population served. The program result should reflect a statement of the best consequence for the clients served from the specific services provided.

**The program result
statement should clearly
identify the client served
and the improvement in the
condition of the client as a
result of the services
provided.**

The program result answers the following questions:

- What is the specific condition that should occur from the services provided?
- What is the intended product or change in condition in the clients served from the service or intervention provided?

The program result will be the basis for determining what should specifically be measured through indicators and operational measures so it is essential that this *statement be clear, concise and understandable*, especially to non-technical staff and the public. It should be written from the client's perspective – what benefit will the client served receive from the services provided. It is not appropriate to reference the Federal or State mandate, or even a Board of Supervisors instruction as the reason why the program exists; instead, focus on what result the program is *designed to produce in terms of the clients served*. Once the intended results are articulated, then manner in which to measure achievement of the result will be clear and, in many cases, self-evident.

- **Program Indicator** – A measure, for which data is available, that reflects the achievement of a program result. The program indicator is the specific measure that quantifies achievement of the program result. Managers should select one or more indicator that will help them understand if the intended result is being achieved. In many cases, more than one indicator may be appropriate to measure the achievement of the result.

The following program result is an example of one that may require multiple indicators:

Low-income/poverty level families and individuals have increased self-sufficiency by moving from at-risk (in-crisis or vulnerable) levels to levels of growth (stable, safe and thriving).

Multiple indicators are likely required to determine if the families are moving to increasing level of stable, safe and thriving growth such as indicators related to employment, health, housing, etc.

**Program indicators quantify
the achievement of the
program result.**

Program indicators should answer the questions:

- How will I know if I am achieving the program result?
- Are the services provided achieving the desired result?

Program indicators are data reference points for managers. There is a correlation between progress made on the indicator and achievement of a result. For example, if more at-risk youth are enrolled in secondary education as a result of services, the management staff knows that it is achieving its result of having more at-risk youth moving towards stable employment. The desired trend or “good performance” should be self-evident based on the program result statement and the indicator selected. Based on this example, an increase in secondary education enrollment is a positive trend. The program indicators should indicate to the reader whether an increase or decrease in the trend is “good” performance.

Program indicators and operational measures are both quantifiable and identify the specific data that will be reported. In the section below (see Measuring the Right Stuff), criteria for selecting and using performance data for program indicators and operational measures is provided.

- **Operational Measure** – A measure of how well a program, agency or service system is working. Measures can reflect the traditional means of evaluating resources involved in the process such as input, workload/output, and efficiency. Operational measures can also reflect the quality of the process in terms of customer satisfaction or compliance with standards. The measures selected by each department should reflect the specific improvement priorities of the department so that managers will have the information to know if the intended improvements are being realized.

Operational measures quantify the quality of how well the services were provided from a cost, resource, efficiency or customer perspective.

Operational measures should answer the question:

- How well were the program services provided?
- Was the process responsive to customer needs and/or external mandates?

Common ways of measuring the process of providing a service include:

- **Input** – Resources used to provide the program or services, such as the number of employees, type of employees, dollar amounts, materials, and facilities. Inputs are simply what is required to provide the service or program.
- **Workload/Output** – Measures of products or units of service provided to a service population. Output measures indicate how much service was provided, but do not explain how well the service was provided or the resulting change from the service. Output measures could include the number of miles of road paved, the number of arrests, the number of library materials circulated, the amount of facility square footage maintained, or the number of parenting classes held.
- **Efficiency** – Efficiency is a measure of the ratio of input to output. This is generally measured in dollars, but can also be measured in terms of cycle time. Efficiency generally takes into consideration the total cost required to provide the service divided by the number of outputs. Efficiency is often reported in terms of a trend over a period of time. Levels of efficiency could include the cost per mile of paved road, the cost per square foot for facility maintenance, or the average time for processing a permit.

Note: In order to track efficiency improvement over time, costs should be converted to common dollars, discounting for inflation. This will provide a consistent basis for trend analysis of the resources required to support output.

- **Quality** - Quality is a broad term to represent how well a process met expectations and can be a subjective evaluation. One common way to measure quality is based on customer expectation. How well did the process meet customer expectations? Was the customer satisfied? Quality can also be measured based on accepted standards of performance, such as percentage of roads in “good” condition based on accepted standards, responsive time frames, or percentage of employees with applicable certifications. The assumption in the second case is that the process will be of better quality if the employees performing the work are trained and certified to perform the work.

PROGRAM DEFINITION

One of the challenges in developing the reporting format is developing a common definition of “programs.” It is suggested that departments use the current programs or budget units as presented in the FY 2003/04 Proposed Budget as a starting point, recognizing that development of measures and results statements may prompt departments to re-evaluate the organization of programs in their budget submission.

Programs can include a range of specific services but, from a performance measurement perspective, they should have enough in common that performance can be measured by a meaningful common set of program indicators and operational measures. Do these services have a common result? For example, different services may be provided to the same client target group under various programs with the same intended result, such as employment, or family stability. This set of programs may be grouped together for presentation and performance reporting. The opposite is also true, if a common set of meaningful measures cannot be developed for a “grouping” of services, the services may need to be disaggregated for budget and performance reporting purposes.

MEASURING THE RIGHT STUFF

In sum, departments are responsible for preparing the three key elements of the *Performance Counts!* framework for each program included in the 2004/05 Proposed Budget: **program result, program indicator, and operational measure.**

The exercise over the next few months will be to prepare this information and to make it meaningful and useful for managers, policymakers and the public to review and understand. The first test in preparing the information is *clarity - are the program results, program indicators and operational measures clear and understandable?*

One means for ensuring that the information is clear is to seek an outside perspective to validate:

- ☐ Program result is clear and understandable
- ☐ Data noted for program indicators and operational measures can be interpreted by a non-technical person
- ☐ Information is meaningful from a client or outside perspective.

The roll-out plan for *Performance Counts!* organizes departments into six roll-out groups. Roll-out groups include departments with both similar and dissimilar functions. They are one way to provide departments with the “outside” perspective to validate draft *Performance Counts!* information.

The second part of knowing whether the “right stuff is being measured” is to validate the specific data sources that will be used for program indicators and operational measures. Four important factors to consider in selecting data is reliability, credibility, controllability and comparability.

- **Reliability – Are the suggested data sources reliable for current and future reporting?**

- Program managers should select program indicators and operational measures that managers are confident will be available over a period of time. The reliability of measures and data source should be seriously considered and assured. Will this information be available next year and in the future? Is it a common recognized source of information? For example, program managers must balance the value of data that may be important but cumbersome or costly to collect against alternative data that may be reliable and readily accessible. Any measurement data should be statistically available on a frequent basis so that results can be reported and decisions can be made on a regular basis.

- **Credibility – Is the data source credible and recognized as basis for program evaluation and reporting?**

Industry standards are an excellent starting point for selection measures. Public Works services, for example, have a common set of measures that are used nationally to measure road condition, traffic conditions, etc. To the degree feasible and appropriate, managers should rely on commonly accepted standards means of measuring programs. Federal and state funded programs are increasingly required to report specific measures for compliance purposes. These measures increasingly relate to program results and can be effective sources of information. Additionally, in many cases the data is already being collected and is available.

- **Controllability – Will this data help me as a manager to improve the performance of my program and services?**

Operational measures should emphasize the aspects of performance that are fundamental and controllable by managers to improve the performance of a program or service. In developing operational measures, managers are encouraged to select those indicators and operational measures that reflect the fundamental factors of what is important in the long-term for providing the specific service.

Aspects of the performance that are not critical to delivering service should not be emphasized, even if it means that results in the short-term will highlight significant areas for improvement. Remember, the value of performance measurement is in identifying areas for improvement and then showing the results of efforts. This closely links to the second point; measures should be ones in which managers can improve performance over time and ones in which managers can and should use on a regular basis to trigger improvement efforts.

○ **Comparability – What will this data be compared to as a means for measuring progress?**

Department managers must also consider how the information will be compared so that the reader can understand whether performance is improving. Performance measurement information must be put in the context of some point of reference so that the reader can evaluate what is “good” performance and what is not. It should be evident from the context, such as trend, comparison to standard, whether the trend in performance should be going up or down. Performance measures without some context are not necessarily valuable information for decision-making. The specific measurement must be put in context for some basis of comparison, such as:

- Time — historical past performance to understand trends;
- Target — comparison of actual versus targeted results; and
- Professional standard — what is generally accepted as a reasonable level of performance by a board of review or peer organizations.

Appendices B and C to these instructions contains worksheets and examples to assist departments in developing program results, program indicators and operational measures. A checklist is also included which can be used to review and critique the program results, indicators and operational measures.

APPLYING TERMS TO DIVERSE COUNTY SERVICES

The County of Los Angeles as an organization is tremendously diverse in the services it provides and the clients that it serves. One of the challenges in building any common reporting framework is to create a system that recognizes this diversity. Because of the broad range of services, County departments are structured to achieve different results and serve different clients.

Departments can generally be organized as having a primary focus that is geared toward one of three results:

- ❑ *Cost-efficient, quality process* – The primary focus of a department in this category is to provide their services in the most cost-efficient, effective manner they can. A quality, efficient process is the primary result of the services. Government services that are process-oriented fall into this category, such as those provided by the Assessor, Auditor-Controller, Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk, Treasurer and Tax Collector, among others. Services provided by these departments have counterparts in the private sector, and there is a high likelihood that standard private sector performance measures that can be tailored to meet the County's needs exist.
- ❑ *Improving individual lives* – For departments in this category, success is measured by the accumulation of results for individual customers. Success is likely to be measured one customer at a time. The overall performance is evaluated by the trend or number of customers that reach the defined successful result. Most health and human services fall into this second category including those provided by Public Social Services, Children and Family Services, Health and Mental Health.
- ❑ *Improving community life* – Departments in this category measure success by the degree to which they improve, maintain and/or protect overall community life. Measurements may often reflect broad community statistics or community conditions. These types of services include those provided by Public Works, Beaches and Harbors, Public Library, Parks and Recreation and public protection departments, such as the Sheriff, Fire Department and District Attorney.

While a department may have multiple program results that they are trying to support, the primary program result type is the one that they are most likely to be held accountable for and measure performance against.

Internally-oriented departments whose result is a quality, efficient process may find that in applying the *Performance Counts!* framework there is not a significant distinction between the program indicators and operational measures. Both are geared towards measuring the quality of the process. In these cases, departments may want to prioritize the most critical aspect of the service as the program indicator.

The categorizations provided above are not strict definitions, but can provide insights into what may be the types of performance data that are most relevant and appropriate for the department and associated programs. By understanding the type of results the departments are focused on achieving, departments can develop performance measures which are in sync with their overall mission as well as understand how the specific measures can help evaluate how to perform its job better.

III. FY 2004/05 BUDGET ROLL-OUT

The 2004/05 Proposed Budget will be the first roll-out for *Performance Counts!* The goal for this first year is for departments to make significant progress in developing performance information consistent with the *Performance Counts!* framework, presenting program results, program indicators and operational measures for all programs included in the 2004/05 budget.

Departments will apply the *Performance Counts!* framework to current programs, as defined in the FY 2003/04 Proposed Budget, and develop a program result statement, program indicator(s) and operational measures for each of these programs.

From surveys of departments and the pilot effort, it is clear that experience in performance measurement varies among County departments. Some departments have already invested significant effort and resources in performance measurement through their strategic planning process or other initiatives. Departments may also have developed measurements through their work on the Children and Families Budget. This work can be used for and/or built upon for *Performance Counts!* reporting.

Departments may use any performance measurement methodology to develop their own set of measures. Departments are encouraged to use whatever methodology they have found effective to develop performance measures, such as Balanced Scorecard or Results Based Decision Making as long as the end result of this effort is the selection and identification of indicators to measure results, and operational measures to evaluate the process to achieve the result.

REPORTING PERIOD

Consistent with prior budget presentations, to the degree available, departments should provide the following data for each program indicator and operational measure:

- ☐ 2001/02 Actual
- ☐ 2002/03 Actual
- ☐ 2003/04 Estimated
- ☐ 2004/05 Projected

Examples from pilot departments are presented in Appendix C and illustrate the format for reporting.

DATA COLLECTION LIMITATIONS

Departments may find that, for this initial year, data may not be available to support reporting at the present time. Departments should weigh costs and benefits associated with initiating additional data collection versus relying on available data sources. If departments do not have historical data available, but intend to begin data collection, they should note when data collection efforts would begin.

TRAINING AND ROLL-OUT

Departments have been organized into six groups. Each department group will be supported by a consultant coach(es), pilot department mentors and CAO budget analysts. Appendix A provides a listing of the groups and resources.

IV. IMPLEMENTATION GUIDELINES

This section is intended to provide some guidance for departments in preparing their Performance Counts! information. Additional guidance can be provided from coaches, mentors and internal department resources.

PILOT LESSONS LEARNED

The experience of the pilot departments provides some guidance on how departments can successfully navigate the process of updating and revising their performance measures consistent with *Performance Counts!* The implementation plan that organizes departments into six groups is one example. Group participants from a mix of departments provide important feedback to each other in the process of developing program result statements, program indicators, and operational measures.

One of the most significant “lessons learned” from the pilot was that dedicating resources and ensuring executive and management commitment are critical to the successful implementation. It is suggested that each department form a leadership team to guide their department through the effort including representatives from the following:

- ❑ Strategic Plan contact;
- ❑ Budget or financial reporting unit; and
- ❑ Senior management.

Pilot departments found it helpful to designate core staff to *Performance Counts!* who are familiar with the department’s reporting structure, terminology and staff, and then have this core staff coordinate and work directly with program managers. The core staff was able to draft sample result statements and then have the program staff review and edit the statements. The core staff also provided both technical and coordination leadership. Core staff selected by a department should be available to attend training and meetings.

GETTING STARTED

Departments should begin their efforts by organizing the resources to support this effort, as stated above, and then prioritize which programs will be addressed first. The recommended next steps are as follows:

- **Start with Program Results**– For each program, the *Performance Counts!* framework requires: 1) a **program result** statement that explains why the program exists or why the services are provided 2); **program indicators**, which measure achievement of the program result; and 3) **operational measures** that reflect how well services were provided.(Refer to Section II for definitions of these terms).

The program result statement is starting point for the *Performance Counts!* reporting framework and the key to selecting the program indicators and operational measures for a program. As noted previously, once a program result statement has been articulated, the program indicator(s) and operational measures will likely become self evident.

- **Evaluate Current Performance Measures for Potential Program Indicators and Operational Measures** – In selecting program indicators and operational measures, a good starting place is to evaluate what performance data information is already collected and reported for the Proposed County Budget, Children and Families Budget, internal purposes or compliance with external or funding mandates. Increasingly, Federal and State funding sources have mandated what data needs to be collected and how it must be reported.
- **Focus on a Few Good Program Indicator(s) and Operational Measures** – As departments are starting performance measurement, the focus should be on identifying a core set of program indicators and measures that will assist in evaluating and understanding performance results. Initially, a department may identify only one program indicator that best quantifies the results of a service or program, and two to four operational measures that best describe how well the services are provided and/or describe how well the process of achieving the program result occurred.

It is the responsibility of department management to select and develop the most informative program indicators and operational measures that highlight areas of performance that are critical to, and reflective of, the services provided, as well as specific departmental priorities.

- **Begin to Build Baseline Data** – For departments that will be making major changes to current reporting efforts or embarking for the first time in performance measurement, it is important to note that the first two years should be dedicated to compiling and understanding the data, and looking for trends. Performance measurement information is useful in context of trends, comparison with standards or other benchmarks. Data will become more useful in triggering operational improvements as managers become familiar with analyzing and using the results. Additionally, data may not all be available in year one. Departments should look at these initial efforts as building a baseline data set that will be continuously improved over time.

Although *Performance Counts!* is a new requirement for departments in performance measurement reporting, performance measurement is not new for the County. Parallel efforts have been progressing throughout the County, such as the Strategic Plan, MAPP, and the Children and Families Budget, to increase County accountability and focus on results. *Performance Counts!* represents the next logical and critical step in bringing these pieces together in helping the County achieve its Mission to: Enrich Lives through Effective and Caring Service.

APPENDICES

- A. *PERFORMANCE COUNTS!* ROLL-OUT GROUPS**
- B. *PERFORMANCE COUNTS!* WORKSHEETS**
- C. PILOT DEPARTMENT EXAMPLES**

APPENDIX A
FY 2004/05 PERFORMANCE COUNTS!
ROLL-OUT GROUPS

	DEPARTMENTS	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE ANALYSTS	PILOT DEPT MENTOR	CONSULTANT COACH
--	-------------	--	----------------------	---------------------

Group #1				
1	Health	Amy Bennett Raul Rios	Community & Senior Services	Cheryl Stecher, Altmayer Consulting
2	Mental Health	Rene Phillips		

Group #2				
1	Children and Family Services	Kathy House		
2	Public Social Services	Gevork Simdjian		
3	Probation	Amalia Lopez		
4	Regional Planning	Alice Yang		
5	Arts Commission	Alice Yang		
6	Executive Office, Board of Supervisors	Alice Yang		
7	District Attorney	Sheila Williams		

	DEPARTMENTS	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE ANALYSTS	PILOT DEPT MENTOR	CONSULTANT COACH
--	-------------	--	----------------------	---------------------

Group #3				
1	Child Support Services	James Blunt	Public Works	Tom Altmayer, Altmayer Consulting
2	Community Development Commission	James Blunt		
3	Alternate Public Defender	Rosemary Gutierrez		
4	Public Defender	Rosemary Gutierrez		
5	Human Relations Commission	Lance Kaneshiro		
6	Consumer Affairs	Lance Kaneshiro		
7	Office of Affirmative Action Compliance	Lance Kaneshiro		

Group #4				
1	Sheriff	Brian Mahan	Internal Services	Tom Altmayer, Altmayer Consulting
2	DHR/Office of Public Safety	Brian Mahan		
3	Ombudsman	Brian Mahan/Cynthia Duong		
4	Coroner	Mark Sandoval/Ernie Miyamoto		
5	Animal Care and Control	Ernie Miyamoto		
6	Agricultural Commissioner/Weights and Measures	Ernie Miyamoto		
7	Fire	Ernie Miyamoto		

	DEPARTMENTS	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE ANALYSTS	PILOT DEPT MENTOR	CONSULTANT COACH
--	-------------	--	----------------------	---------------------

Group #5				
1	County Counsel	Rick Cavataio		
2	Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk	Rick Cavataio		
3	Chief Information Office	Rick Cavataio		
4	Treasurer and Tax Collector	Corina Calixto		
5	Assessor	Corina Calixto		
6	Auditor-Controller	Corina Calixto		
7	Chief Administrative Office	Shari Nishi		

Group #6				
1	Public Library	Dorinne Jordan	Public Works	Tom Altmayer, Altmayer Consulting
2	Museum of Natural History	Dorinne Jordan		
3	Museum of Art	Dorinne Jordan		
4	Military and Veterans Affairs	Dorinne Jordan		
5	Parks and Recreation	Cynthia Duong		
6	Beaches and Harbors	Yolanda Reyes		

APPENDIX B

PERFORMANCE COUNTS! WORKSHEETS

WORKSHEET FOR THE *PERFORMANCE COUNTS!* REPORTING FORMAT

PROGRAM NAME:

PROGRAM RESULT:

Name the specific clients served; State the intended result from the services or interventions provided;

State what change/condition should occur for the clients served from the services provided.

PROGRAM INDICATORS:

Specify measures for which data is available that quantify achievement of the program result;

Consider "What did we achieve? How do we know that the desired change occurred?"

OPERATIONAL MEASURES:

Specify measures of how well a program, agency or service system is working, e.g., input workload/output, efficiency, and/or quality. Use one or more measures that best describe how well the service delivery/intervention process was carried out; Consider "How well was the service provided?"

Worksheet Examples

WORKSHEET FOR THE *PERFORMANCE COUNTS!* REPORTING FORMAT

PROGRAM NAME:

Workforce Investment Act.

PROGRAM RESULT:

Name the specific clients served; State the intended result from the services or interventions provided;

State what change/condition should occur for the clients served from the services provided.

Low-income youth ages 14-21 successfully transition into the
workforce.

PROGRAM INDICATORS:

Specify measures for which data is available that quantify achievement of the program result; Consider "What did we achieve? How do we know that the desired change occurred?"

Percentage of youth exiting program who are employed, in military
or enrolled in post-secondary education nine months after exiting
the program.

OPERATIONAL MEASURES:

Specify measures of how well a program, agency or service system is working, e.g., input workload/output, efficiency, and/or quality. Use one or more measures that best describe how well the service delivery/intervention process was carried out; Consider "How well was the service provided?"

Number of youth served; Cost per youth served; Percentage of youths
satisfied with services provided.

WORKSHEET FOR THE *PERFORMANCE COUNTS!* REPORTING FORMAT

PROGRAM NAME:

Acquisition Services

PROGRAM RESULT:

Name the specific clients served; State the intended result from the services or interventions provided;

State what change/condition should occur for the clients served from the services provided.

County departments have the goods, materials and services they
need when they need them and at a cost-effective price.

PROGRAM INDICATORS:

Specify measures for which data is available that quantify achievement of the program result; Consider "What did we achieve? How do we know that the desired change occurred?"

Percentage of departments that rely on the County central services for
purchasing services and rank the value of those services as high.

OPERATIONAL MEASURES:

Specify measures of how well a program, agency or service system is working, e.g., input workload/output, efficiency, and/or quality. Use one or more measures that best describe how well the service delivery/intervention process was carried out; Consider "How well was the service provided?"

Percentage of purchases issued within targeted number of days,
e.g., 30 days; Percentage of purchases which result in vendor
protests.

WORKSHEET FOR THE *PERFORMANCE COUNTS!* REPORTING FORMAT

PROGRAM NAME:

Flood Control Services

PROGRAM RESULT:

Name the specific clients served; State the intended result from the services or interventions provided;

State what change/condition should occur for the clients served from the services provided.

LA County residents, businesses and homes are protected from

potential damage with adequate and necessary general flood control protection.

PROGRAM INDICATORS:

Specify measures for which data is available that quantify achievement of the program result; Consider "What did we achieve? How do we know that the desired change occurred?"

Trend in annual cost due to flood damage in LA County.

OPERATIONAL MEASURES:

Specify measures of how well a program, agency or service system is working, e.g., input workload/output, efficiency, and/or quality. Use one or more measures that best describe how well the service delivery/intervention process was carried out; Consider "How well was the service provided?"

Annual dollar value of flood control investments; Percentage of
flood control projects completed on-time and on-budget.

WORKSHEET FOR THE *PERFORMANCE COUNTS!* REPORTING FORMAT

PROGRAM NAME:

Recruitment

PROGRAM RESULT:

Name the specific clients served; State the intended result from the services or interventions provided;

State what change/condition should occur for the clients served from the services provided.

County departments have qualified candidates available to meet

staffing requirements consistent with the County's hiring process.

PROGRAM INDICATORS:

Specify measures for which data is available that quantify achievement of the program result;

Consider "What did we achieve? How do we know that the desired change occurred?"

Percentage of department managers and supervisors that rate new

hires as "qualified" or good six months after hiring.

OPERATIONAL MEASURES:

Specify measures of how well a program, agency or service system is working, e.g., input workload/output, efficiency, and/or quality. Use one or more measures that best describe how well the service delivery/intervention process was carried out; Consider "How well was the service provided?"

Annual number of recruitments; Annual number of applicants;

Cost per new hire.

CHECKLIST FOR THE *PERFORMANCE COUNTS!* REPORTING FORMAT

PROGRAM RESULT:

✓ *Does my Program Result...*

- ☐ Assert an affirmative statement of the end-condition?
- ☐ Identify the clients served, such as “low-income youth” or “other County departments”?
- ☐ Identify the change or improvement that will occur as a result of the intervention or services provided, such as “successful transition into workforce” or “cost-effective goods and services”?

INDICATORS:

✓ *Are the Program Indicator(s)...*

- ☐ Quantifiable measures that show the progress towards providing the intended condition (program result)?
- ☐ Understandable to the general public?
- ☐ Logical?
- ☐ Based on data that is available and reliable?
- ☐ Reflect data or information that will be useful over time?

OPERATIONAL MEASURES:

✓ *Do the Operational Measures measure an essential element of performance?*

- ☐ Cost?
- ☐ Quality?
- ☐ Cycle time?
- ☐ Output?

✓ *Do they also compare those measurements with a point of reference, such as...*

- ☐ Historical reference?
- ☐ Target or professional standard?
- ☐ Comparable organization?

✓ *Do they link to an area targeted for improvement, such as...*

- ☐ Increasing workload – providing more service?
- ☐ Reducing cost – decreasing resources required to provide the service?
- ☐ Improving quality – better meeting customer needs?

APPENDIX C

PILOT DEPARTMENT EXAMPLES

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AND SENIOR SERVICES

Performance Counts!

Programs and Services

The Department of Community and Senior Services (CSS) provides an array of safety net social and human services to residents of the County of Los Angeles. These services are delivered through over 29 different programs throughout the County by an extensive network of non-profit community-based organizations, cities, and quasi-governmental entities. This network is complemented by partnerships with other County departments such as the Departments of Public Social Services, Children and Family Services, Mental Health, Health Services, Consumer Affairs, Treasurer Tax Collector, Internal Services, Public Library, Probation, Community Development Commission, and the Office of the District Attorney. In addition, CSS provides administrative and staff support to the Area Agency on Aging Advisory Council, Los Angeles County Commission on Aging, Community Action Board, Domestic Violence Council, Native American Indian Commission, and the Workforce Investment Board.

Community and Senior Services operates the following programs and services:

- **Adult Protective Services (APS)**
- Congregate Meals and Home Delivered Meals
- Community Service Centers and Community Senior Centers
- Welfare-to-Work (WtW)
- Refugee CalWORKs Project
- Domestic Violence CalWORKs Project
- Senior Citizen Programs
- Healthcare Workforce Development (WPD)
- **Community Service Programs**
- Refugee Employment Programs (REP)
- General Relief Opportunities for Work Projects (GROW)
- Alzheimer Day Care Resource Center (ADCRC)
- Health Insurance Counseling and Advocacy Program (HICAP)
- Family Care Giver Support Program
- **Workforce Investment Act and WorkSource Centers**
- Parents Fair Share (PFS)
- Rapid Response
- Youth CalWORKs Long Term Family Self Sufficiency Project
- Mini Career CalWORKs Long Term Family Self Sufficiency Project
- Domestic Violence Long Term Family Self Sufficiency Project
- State Naturalization Program
- Elder Abuse Program
- Long Term Care Integration Planning
- Domestic Violence Program
- Dispute Resolution Program
- Native American Indian Program
- Senior Employment Program (Title V)
- Linkages Program
- Traffic Safety Program

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AND SENIOR SERVICES
Performance Counts! - Proposed Performance Measurement

Program Name: Adult Protective Services (APS)

Program Description:

Adult Protective Services (APS) is a State-mandated program to provide crisis intervention and case management services to elders and dependent adults who are victims of neglect, abuse or exploitation, or who are unable to protect their own interests, and to family members on behalf of the victims. Although the level of service is discretionary, curtailment would result in endangerment of clients, and would have financial and workload implications for other County departments. APS receives an average of 1600 reports each month of suspected dependent adult/elder abuse and self-neglect. A reduction in funding would grossly impact the County's ability to meet the State mandate and to deliver services to this frail/at-risk population, resulting in further endangerment, loss of assets, institutionalization, or even death.

Program Result: Elder (aged 65+) and dependent adults (aged 18-64) with physical and/or mental limitations restricting the ability to carry on normal activities have reduced risk for abuse, neglect (including self-neglect), and exploitation.

Indicators	2001-02 Actual	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Estimated	2004-05 Projected
Percentage of elder and dependent adults whose risk was reduced based on CSS independent ranking.	N/A	N/A	N/A	

Explanatory Notes/Comments: Data collection will start in fiscal year 2003-04.

Operational Measures	2001-02 Actual	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Estimated	2004-05 Projected
APS program expenditures	\$23,098,858	\$24,000,000	\$25,809,000	
Number of clients served	18,429	20,600	22,154	
Trend in cost per APS served	\$1,253	\$1,165	\$1,165	
Percentage of cases closed within 90 days	N/A	N/A	N/A	

Explanatory Notes/Comments: Data collection will start in fiscal year 2003-04.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AND SENIOR SERVICES
Performance Counts! - Proposed Performance Measurement

Program Name: Workforce Investment Act (WIA)

Program Description:

The Workforce Investment Act (WIA) is a federal funded program that provides a wide range of employment and training services for adults and youth who are economically disadvantaged, unemployed, or dislocated workers. This program is intended to be customer-focused, to help customers access the tools they need to manage their careers through information and high quality services, and assist employers to find skilled workers. Services include classroom training, on-the-job training, and work experience. Approximately 22,000 individuals are served in the Employment and Training program each year, including an estimated 4,000 individuals on welfare. Of the 6,300 persons who are in job training, over 72 percent are placed in unsubsidized employment. Elimination of this program would make WIA assistance unavailable to persons who need job training or work experience in order to find and retain employment.

Program Result:

WIA Youth - High-risk low-income youth ages 14 to 21 successfully transition into the workforce and continued training and/or education.

WIA Adult/Dislocated Worker - Unemployed and disadvantaged persons in the County workforce investment area have increased level of self-sufficiency..

Indicators	2001-02 Actual	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Estimated	2004-05 Projected
WIA YOUTH				
Percentage of youths exiting program who are employed, in military, or enrolled in post-secondary education nine months after exit.	63%	65%	65%	
Percentage of youths who obtained high school diploma or GED.	N/A	45%	45%	
WIA ADULT				
Percentage of Adult Entered Employment.	82%	70%	70%	
Percentage of Adult Retention Rate in six months after program exit.	86%	80%	80%	
Adult Earnings change in six months after program exit.	\$3,888	\$3,700	\$3,700	

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AND SENIOR SERVICES
Performance Counts! - Proposed Performance Measurement

WIA DISLOCATED WORKER			
Percentage of Dislocated Worker Entered Employment.	82%	75%	75%
Percentage of Dislocated Worker Retention Rate in six months after program exit.	90%	80%	80%
Percentage of Dislocated Worker Earnings Replacement Rate in six months after program exit.	94%	86%	86%

Explanatory Notes/Comments: FY 2001-02: WIA YOUTH – the goal was exceeded by 13% (63%). State Performance Standards require 50% youths entered employment, military, or post-secondary education nine months after program exit. WIA ADULT and DISLOCATED WORKER – the goals were exceeded, based on weighted average of State Performance Standards. For Adult, the program exceeded an entered employment rate by 14% (82%), a six-month retention rate by 10% (86%) with increase average earnings by \$288 (\$3,888). For Dislocated Worker, the program achieved entered employment rate by 13% (82%), a six-month retention rate by 7% (90%) and an earnings replacement by 8% (94%). In FY2003-04, WIA reauthorization for Adult/Dislocated Worker will focuses not on self-sufficiency, but rather job placement, and for Youth on providing longer-term services to the hardest-to-serve, out-of-school youth, which can be most challenging goal to achieve because youth traditionally have harder time staying attached to the workforce than adults. Performance measures for this year are based on State's Performance Standards and may be renegotiated with the U.S. Department of Labor.

Operational Measures	2001-02 Actual	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Estimated	2004-05 Projected
WIA Youth Expenditures	\$17,061,443	\$16,206,830	\$17,400,560	
Number of youths served	5,212	4,100	4,402	
Average cost per youth served	\$3,273	\$3,953	\$3,953	
WIA Adult Expenditures	\$16,099,024	\$18,925,378	\$14,321,634	
Number of Adult served	4,167	4,650	4,000	
Average cost per Adult participant	\$3,863	\$4,070	\$3,580	
WIA Dislocated Worker Expenditures	\$13,782,224	\$14,020,574	\$11,790,440	
Number of Dislocated Worker served	2,524	2,550	2,000	
Average cost per Dislocated Worker participant	\$5,460	\$5,498	\$5,895	

Explanatory Notes/Comments:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AND SENIOR SERVICES
Performance Counts! - Proposed Performance Measurement

Program Name: COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS - Community Services Block Grant

Program Description:

Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) provides federal funds to effectively elevate low income, poverty-level families and individuals within the County of Los Angeles out of the cycle of poverty and dependency by funding initiatives that fight its causes, especially unemployment, inadequate housing, poor nutrition, and lack of education opportunity. CSBG program also integrate funding with other program dollars, including WIA, Domestic Violence, Citizenship programs and the Department's Service Centers. Loss of these programs would put individuals and families at further risk and increase costs to other County and public agencies.

Program Result: Low-income/poverty level families and individuals have increased self-sufficiency by moving them from at-risk (in-crisis or vulnerable) levels to levels of growth (stable, safe and thriving).

Indicators	2001-02 Actual	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Estimated	2004-05 Projected
Percentage of At-Risk Clients reaching a level of self-sufficiency:				
1. Employment	29%	31%	31%	
2. Education	6%	29%	29%	
3. Housing	8%	19%	19%	
4. Emergency Services ⁽¹⁾	121%	49%	49%	
5. Nutrition	17%	50%	50%	
6. Linkages with other programs	9%	25%	25%	
7. Health	46%	29%	29%	

Explanatory Notes/Comments: Individual needs of the clients can range from one program category to seven program categories. (1) Effective 2002, safety-net clients cannot be duplicated which will result in lower percentage than those previous years.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AND SENIOR SERVICES
Performance Counts! - Proposed Performance Measurement

Operational Measures	2001-02 Actual	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Estimated	2004-05 Projected
Program Expenditures	\$5,911,545	\$6,578,195	\$6,578,195	
<u>Workload/Output – At-Risk Clients ⁽¹⁾</u>				
Program Category				
1. Employment	995	1,100	1,100	
2. Education	2,149	2,149	2,149	
3. Housing	1,074	1,564	1,564	
4. Emergency Services	2,569	2,569	2,569	
5. Nutrition	1,284	1,809	1,809	
6. Linkages with other programs	5,685	5,685	5,685	
TOTAL	14,433	15,553	15,553	

Explanatory Notes/Comments:

INTERNAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT Performance Counts

Program Name: Acquisition Services

Program Description:

Centralized purchasing services as mandated by County Charter to assure that the acquisition process is fair and even-handed, yet provide the best value in goods and services to County departments. Serves an advisory and oversight function for Board mandated programs for County contracts.

Program Result:

County departments are procured or contracted services in a cost-efficient and timely manner and in accordance with the County Charter.

Indicators	2001-02 Actual	2002-03 Est. Actual	2003-04 Estimated	2004-05 Projected	Target
Overall customer satisfaction rating of Acquisition Services on Annual Customer Survey (1)	4.1	4.1	4.0	4.0	4.0
Average rating on Annual Customer Survey for timeliness of Acquisition Services delivery (1)	3.8	3.7	3.7	3.7	4.0
Average customer satisfaction rating with training, advisory, and consulting services for purchasing and contracting.	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0

Explanatory Notes/Comments: (1) The Contracting Services and Purchasing Services are the customer survey areas included for Acquisition Services. Survey scale is 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest).
TBD = To be determined

Operational Measures	2001-02 Actual	2002-03 Est. Actual	2003-04 Estimated	2004-05 Projected	Target
Percent of on-time service delivery A. % of Routine Direct POs issued within 30 days B. % of Complex Direct POs issued within 30 days	76% (2)	74% (2)	A. TBD B. TBD	A. TBD B. TBD	90%
Percent of benchmarked expenditures within 10% of market. A. PCS: % of purchasing fees that are equal to or lower than other government agencies.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Percent of scheduled monitoring activities completed on ISD contracts by the scheduled date.	100%	98%	98%	98%	90%

Explanatory Notes/Comments: (2) Timeliness of processing Purchase Orders will be tracked separately for routine versus complex purchases beginning 2003-04 FY.

INTERNAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT Performance Counts

Program Name: Building Support

Program Description:

Provides facility related support services to County Departments.

Program Result:

County employees and the public have access to clean, safe, pleasant, and energy efficient County buildings (supported by ISD).

Indicators	2001-02 Actual	2002-03 Est. Actual	2003-04 Estimated	2004-05 Projected	Target
Overall customer satisfaction rating of Building Support services on Annual Customer Survey (1)	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	4.0
Percentage of County departments that do a significant amount of business with ISD in strategic areas: A. Building Maintenance Services (by sq.ft.) B. Energy	A. 44% B. 89% (not final)	Not yet available	TBD	TBD	A. 83% B. 98%
Average Building Support Services rating on Annual Customer Survey for timeliness of service delivery (1) Percent of system or building uptime	3.8	3.6	3.6	3.6	4.0
A. Key Building Systems (e.g. vertical transportation, HVAC, primary plumbing & electrical elements, security/alarm systems) B. Power Plants	A. N/A B. 99.8%	A. N/A B. 99.73%	A. N/A B. 99.5%	A. N/A B. 99.5%	A. 99.0% B. 99.5%
Average overall Building Support Services rating from Annual Customer Survey on reasonableness of costs (1)	3.2	3.1	3.1	3.1	4.0
Percent of detailed building assessments completed and highest priority requirements presented to CAO for budget consideration for locations where ISD provides primary maintenance services	15%	20%	TBD	TBD	100%
Percent departments receiving energy conservation consultation from ISD	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Explanatory Notes: (1) Alterations & Improvements, Building Maintenance, Custodial Services, Energy Management, and Parking are the building support areas included in the customer survey. N/A = not available. TBD = To be determined. Survey scale is 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest).
TBD = To be determined

INTERNAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT

Performance Counts

Operational Measures	2001-02 Actual	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Estimated	2004-05 Projected	Target
Percent of on-time service delivery: FOS % of M&O trouble calls completed by published standards for routine (3 days); emergency (2 hours); and discomfort (4 hours)	N/A	WIP	TBD	TBD	96%
Percent of square feet of viable County buildings that have completed energy retrofits.	44%	66%	66%	66%	90%
Percent of benchmarked expenditures within 10% of market. Includes Custodial, Grounds Maintenance, HVAC, Electrical, Plumbing, Elevators, Heating & Frost Services. (2)	75%	79%	76%	76%	100%

Explanatory Notes/Comments:

N/A = not available; WIP= Work In Progress on performance results from internal system
(2) Benchmark to market reflects overall percentage. The details reflect that all but one line of service are within the target.

INTERNAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT Performance Counts

Program Name: Communication Services

Program Description:

Provide network and communication systems such as Wide Area Network, Building Infrastructure, and Radio Systems.

Program Result:

County departments have access to cost-efficient and responsive networks and communications systems (supported by ISD),

Indicators	2001-02 Actual	2002-03 Est. Actual	2003-04 Estimated	2004-05 Projected	Target
Overall customer satisfaction rating of Communication Services on Annual Customer Survey (1)	3.8	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Percentage of County departments that do a significant amount of business with ISD in strategic areas: A. Countywide Communications Network	88% (not final)	Not yet available	TBD	TBD	100%
Average rating on Annual Customer Survey for timeliness of Communication Services delivery (1)	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	4.0
Percent of system or building uptime A. Network	99.95%	99.985%	99.985%	99.985%	99.99%
Average overall Communication Services rating from Annual Customer Survey on reasonableness of costs (1)	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.1	4.0

Explanatory Notes: (1) Audio Video, Network Services, Radio Systems, and Telephone Systems are the customer survey areas included for Communication Services. Survey scale is 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest). TBD = To be determined

Operational Measures	2001-02 Actual	2002-03 Est. Actual	2003-04 Estimated	2004-05 Projected	Target
Percent of on-time service delivery A. % of service requests and projects completed as scheduled for ITS' Network Services, Radio Services, Telephones, Data Services (within 15, 20, and 40 days), and Premises Systems Engineering.	77.9%	85.4%	92.5%	92.5%	92.5%
Percent of benchmarked expenditures within 10% of market. ITS: Telecomm Services	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

INTERNAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT Performance Counts

Program Name: Data Center Management

Program Description:

Provide computing and data security services for mainframe, mid-range, and web based computer and internet systems.

Program Result:

County departments have access to timely manner and cost efficient County computer and internet systems (supported by ISD).

Indicators	2001-02 Actual	2002-03 Est. Actual	2003-04 Estimated	2004-05 Projected	Target
Overall customer satisfaction rating of Data Center services on Annual Customer Survey (1)	3.8	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Percentage of County departments that do a significant amount of business with ISD in strategic areas: A. Data Center	79% (not final)	Not yet available	TBD	TBD	80%
Average rating on Annual Customer Survey for timeliness of Data Center service delivery (1)	3.4	3.9	3.9	3.9	4.0
Percent of system or building uptime A. Data Center	99.90%	99.90%	99.90%	99.90%	99.95%
Average overall Data Center services rating from Annual Customer Survey on reasonableness of costs (1)	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.4	4.0

Explanatory Notes/Comments: (1) Computer Operations & Maintenance and IT Help Desk are the customer survey areas included for Data Center Management. Survey scale is 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest).
TBD = To be determined

Operational Measures	2001-02 Actual	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Estimated	2004-05 Projected	Target
Percent of on-time service delivery A. % of Help Desk Calls on hold for 60 seconds or less	70%	76%	78%	80%	90%
Percent of benchmarked expenditures within 10% of market for Data Centers.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

INTERNAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT Performance Counts

Program Name: Other Services

Program Description:

Provide Mail, Fleet Maintenance, Ceremonies/Special Events Services, Sign Shop, and Printing/Reprographic Services.

Program Result:

County customers and departments have access to cost- efficient and timely Mail, Fleet Maintenance, Ceremonies/Special Events Services, Sign Shop, and Printing/Reprographic Services .

Indicators	2001-02 Actual	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Estimated	2004-05 Projected	Target
Overall customer satisfaction rating of Other ISD services on Annual Customer Survey (1)	4.2	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Average rating on Annual Customer Survey for timeliness of Other ISD services delivery (1)	4.1	3.9	3.9	4.0	4.0
Average overall Other ISD services rating from Annual Customer Survey on reasonableness of costs (1)	3.6	3.4	3.4	3.4	4.0

Explanatory Notes: (1) Mail, Vehicle Services, Special Events, Sign Shop, and Printing/Reprographics are the customer survey areas included for Other Services. Survey scale is 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest).

Operational Measures	2001-02 Actual	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Estimated	2004-05 Projected	Target
Percent of on-time service delivery B. % of Mail Stops kept on schedule C. % of Fleet jobs completed within published standards for minor and major preventive maintenance and scheduled repairs.	A. 99.5% B. N/A	A. 99.9% B. N/A	A. 99% B. N/A	A. 99% B. N/A	A. 99% B. N/A
Percent of benchmarked expenditures within 10% of market. % of Fleet costs that are equal to or lower than a dealership and a moderate size garage.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100%

Explanatory Notes: N/A = Not Available

INTERNAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT Performance Counts

Program Name: Programming Services

Program Description:

Provide applications development, maintenance and enhancements for existing systems and web infrastructure support.

Program Result:

Users of County computer applications (supported by ISD) have access to applications that meet their needs and in most suitable program languages and platform to be available for use in a cost-efficient and timely manner.

Indicators	2001-02 Actual	2002-03 Est. Actual	2003-04 Estimated	2004-05 Projected	Target
Overall customer satisfaction rating of Programming Services on Annual Customer Survey (1)	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.8	4.0
Percentage of County departments that do a significant amount of business with ISD in strategic areas: A. E-commerce/Internet Development Include work done by IDD and CAB divisions Include status-based projects and transaction-based applications.	69% (not final)	Not Yet Available	TBD	TBD	80%
Average rating on Annual Customer Survey for timeliness of Programming Services delivery (1)	3.4	3.6	3.6	3.6	4.0
Average overall Programming Services rating from Annual Customer Survey on reasonableness of costs (1)	3.0	3.2	3.2	3.2	4.0

Explanatory Notes/Comments: (1) Customer Applications & Development and Internet Development are the survey areas that are included for Programming Services. Survey scale is 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest).
TBD = To be determined

Operational Measures	2001-02 Actual	2002-03 Est. Actual	2003-04 Estimated	2004-05 Projected	Target
Percent of on-time service delivery A. ITS % of CAB programming applications completed as scheduled.	N/A	91%	90%	90%	90%
Percent of benchmarked expenditures within 10% of market. A. ITS: CAB	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Percent of ISD services that are accessible via the Internet for: Objective is "ease of accessibility" by customers A. Request services Obtain job status information	10	11	18	TBD	TBD

**County of Los Angeles
Department of Public Works
Performance Counts! - Proposed Performance Measurement Reporting Format**

Program Name: Sewer Collection System

Program Description: Maintenance and operation of sanitary sewer infrastructure.

Program Result: A reliable sewer collection system that conforms to regulatory standards at a reasonable cost.

Indicators	2002-03 Actuals	2003-04 Estimated	2004-05 Projected	2005-06 Projected
Mandated regulatory reports				
Customer complaints/comments				

Explanatory Notes/Comments:
Data is currently being compiled and analyzed.

Operational Measures	2002-03 Actuals	2003-04 Estimated	2004-05 Projected	2005-06 Projected
Periodic cleaning and inspection of system				
Biannual manhole inspections				
Number of customer service requests				
Weekly pump station inspections				

County of Los Angeles
Department of Public Works
Performance Counts! - Proposed Performance Measurement Reporting Format

Program Name: Unincorporated County Roads

Program Description: Maintenance and operation of the unincorporated County roadways, appurtenances, and surrounding right-of-way areas.

Program Result: Roadways and appurtenances within unincorporated County area are safe, smooth, well maintained, and can be traveled in a reasonable time.

Indicators	2002-03 Actuals	2003-04 Estimated	2004-05 Projected	2005-06 Projected
Pavement Ride Quality - % of pavement area with smooth ride	%	%	%	%
Right-of-way Appearance - % of right-of-way with good appearance	N/A	%	%	%
Intersection Level-of-Service Index -LOS Grade Letter	LOS	LOS	LOS	LOS
Accidents per million vehicle miles traveled	# accidents	# accidents	# accidents	# accidents
Explanatory Notes/Comments Data is currently being compiled and analyzed.				

Operational Measures	2002-03 Actuals	2003-04 Estimated	2004-05 Projected	2005-06 Projected
Structural Maintenance Cost/Lane mile	\$15,846	\$14,750	\$14,603	\$14,455
Aesthetic Maintenance Cost/Lane mile	\$2,972	\$2,942	\$2,913	\$2,883
Signal Optimization Improvement ratio	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
Level-of-Service Study completion ratio - #LOS studies completed / # of LOS studies identified or requested	%	%	%	%
Traffic Study completion ratio # of traffic studies completed / # of traffic studies requested	86%	87%	88%	89%
Cost for environmental issues	Total \$	Total \$	Total \$	Total \$

County of Los Angeles
Department of Public Works
Performance Counts! - Proposed Performance Measurement Reporting Format

Program Name: Waterworks

Program Description: Maintenance and operation of water supply facilities.

Program Result: Reliable and quality water that conforms to regulatory requirements at a reasonable cost.

Indicators	2002-03 Actuals	2003-04 Estimated	2004-05 Projected	2005-06 Projected
Standard water quality report required by regulations				
Customer complaints/comments				

Explanatory Notes/Comments:
Data is currently being compiled and analyzed

Operational Measures	2002-03 Actuals	2003-04 Estimated	2004-05 Projected	2005-06 Projected
System inspections performed annually				
System flushing activities				
Customer Call-outs				
Water sampling results				
Valve maintenance				

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES

Performance Counts!

Program Name: Employee Benefits Administration

Program Description: This Division administers the County benefit programs that include Group Insurance Programs (Medical, Dental, and Life), Deferred Compensation Plans (Horizons, Savings, Deferred Earnings and Pension Savings Plans) and the Unemployment Insurance Program. These programs are provided through quality cost-effective services that involve interaction, negotiation and administration of various County contracts with insurance carriers, consultants and third party administrators. In providing employee benefit services to all County employees, the Division administers annual benefits open enrollment campaigns for Choices, Options and Flex/MegaFlex eligible employees, temporary and part-time employees and COBRA participants. The Division also administers ongoing monthly benefit enrollments for new employees. In addition, the Division maintains a customer service telephone hotline and an Employee Benefits Website to assist employees. Other activities include health fairs and wellness seminars coordinated with health care providers to raise employee awareness of health-related issues.

Program Result: County employees receive employee benefits in a timely, efficient, fair and compliant manner that is communicated to them in a customer supportive environment.

Indicators	2001-02 Actual	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Estimated	2004-05 Projected
Percentage of employee benefits enrollment and coverage problems resolved by end of month following receipt.	97	98	95	95
Average time to answer the telephone hotline during peak months.		1:32	1:30	1:30

Explanatory Notes/Comments:

Operational Measures	2001-02 Actual	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Estimated	2004-05 Projected
Annual number of benefit problem cases closed within 60 days.	2,323	2,319	2,200	2,000
Number of calls answered on telephone hotline during peak months.	27,035	24,901	23,000	25,000
Annual number of calls answered on telephone hotline.	10,528	9,203	8,000	8,000
Daily average wait time on telephone hotline.		1:15	1:30	1:30
Average number of calls received on telephone hotline per staff annually.	76	260	3,000	2,500
Average number of problem cases resolved per staff annually.	110	326	325	330

Explanatory Notes/Comments:

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES

Performance Counts!

Program Name: Los Angeles County Training Academy

Program Description: The Organizational and Employee Development Division is responsible for the development of customized programs to develop and enhance the skills of the County workforce. The County Training Academy offers a variety of certificate programs that provide Continuing Education Units or college credit in topic areas such as Budget and Finance, Fiscal Operations, Human Resources, Section/Division Management and Analytical Skills. The Academy also offers skill-building courses for clerical competencies, supervision and performance management and technical aspects of human resources administration. Certain Academy programs may allow candidates to receive credit on applicable Civil Service examinations.

Program Result: Employees are prepared to meet current and future operational needs of the County.

Indicators	2001-02 Actual	2002-03 Actual	2003-04 Estimated	2004-05 Projected
Percent of program participants who report using knowledge and skills acquired in the program on their jobs. *				
Percent of academy programs for which statistically significant knowledge gain is demonstrated. *				

Explanatory Notes/Comments:

Operational Measures	2001-02 Actual	2002-03 Actual**	2003-04 Estimated	2004-05 Projected
Percentage of certificate programs that incorporate at least one (1) learning experience involving the application of learned knowledge or skill to a work activity, problem, or issue.	80%	85%	90%	
Number of employees trained.	12,386	16,432	12,624	
Number of training hours delivered	245,325	285,471	247,440	
Number of training programs conducted.	300	724	630	

Explanatory Notes/Comments:

- * Data on knowledge gain is being compiled and analyzed. We are in the beginning stages of collecting data on the use of acquired knowledge and skills on the job. We will be able to provide Actual, Estimated and Projected figures in during FY 2004-05 Budget process.
- ** Based on estimates. Actual figures will be provided during FY 2004-05 budget process.

